It muſt be allowed that theſe two Gentlemen differ very much in Philoſophy. The one proceeds upon the Evidence ariſing from Experiments and Phænomena, and ſtops where ſuch Evidence is wanting; the other is taken up with Hypotheſes, and propounds them, not to be examined by Experiments, but to be believed without Examination. The one for want of Experiments to decide the Queſtion, doth not affirm whether the Cauſe of Gravity be Mechanical or not Mechanical: the other that it is a perpetual Miracle if it be not Mechanical. The one (by way of Enquiry) attributes it to the Power of the Creator that the leaſt Particles of Matter are hard: the other attributes the Hardneſs of Matter to conſpiring Motions, and calls it a perpetual Miracle if the Cauſe of this Hardneſs be other than Mechanical. The one doth not affirm that animal Motion in Man is purely mechanical: the other teaches that it is purely mechanical, the Soul or Mind (according to the Hypotheſis of an *Harmonia Præſtabilita*) never acting upon the Body ſo as to alter or influence its Motions. The one teaches that God (the God in whom we live and move and have our Being) is Omnipreſent; but not as a Soul of the World: the other that he is not the Soul of the World, but *INTELLIGENTIA SUPRAMUNDANA*, an Intelligence above the Bounds of the World; whence it ſeems to follow that he cannot do any thing within the Bounds of the World, unleſs by an incredible Miracle. The one teaches that Philoſophers are to argue from Phænomena and *Experiments* to the Cauſes thereof, and thence to the Cauſes of thoſe Cauſes, and ſo on till we come to the firſt Cauſe: the other that all the Actions of the firſt Cauſe are Miracles, and all the Laws impreſt on Nature by the Will of God are perpetual Miracles and occult Qualities, and therefore not to be conſidered in Philoſophy. But muſt the conſtant and univerſal Laws of Nature, if derived from the Power of God or the Action of a Cauſe not yet known to us, be called Miracles and occult Qualities, that is to ſay, *Wonders* and *Abſurdities*? Muſt all the Arguments for a God taken from the Phænomena of Nature be exploded by *new hard Names*? And muſt Experimental Philoſophy be exploded as *miraculous* and *abſurd*, becauſe it aſſerts nothing more than can be proved by Experiments, and we cannot yet prove by Experiments that all the Phænomena in Nature can be ſolved by meer Mechanical Cauſes? Certainly theſe things deſerve to be better conſidered.

ER RATA. *Pag.* 199. *lin.* 12. 14. *put an* Aſterisk (*) *after the Word* Letter.